

24. 2004 3:25PM

MEDTRONIC LAW DEPT

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CE R

MAR 24 2004

NO. 0193 P. 1/3



Medtronic

OFFICIAL

Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: Examiner Frenel
Company: USPTO

Fax: 703 746 6065
703 305 7687

From: Daniel G. Chapik
Company: **Medtronic**
Phone: 763 514 3066
Fax: 763 514 6982

Date: March 24, 2004

**Pages including this
cover page:** 3

Comments:

IF TELECOPY IS ILLEGIBLE OR ALL PAGES HAVE NOT BEEN RECEIVED, PLEASE CONTACT
MOLLY CHLEBECK AT TELEPHONE (763) 514-3118 IMMEDIATELY.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ON THIS TRANSMITTAL
FORM. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED
THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY
PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US
BY TELEPHONE, AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ADDRESS LISTED ABOVE VIA THE U.S.
POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

13

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

Applicant(s): Riff et al.

Docket: P-9618.00

MAR 24 2004

Serial No.: 09/943,193

Group Art: 3736

Filed: August 29, 2001

Examiner: V. Frenel

OFFICIAL

Title: MEDICAL DEVICE SYSTEMS IMPLEMENTED NETWORK SCHEME FOR
REMOTE PATIENT MANAGEMENT MEDICAL DEVICE IN MAGNETIC
RESONANCE IMAGING DEVICE

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

On March 23, 2004 a telephone interview was conducted between Daniel Chapik, attorney for applicant, SPE Joseph Thomas and Examiner Frenel.

An interview agenda was submitted by the Applicant prior to the interview, and details the issues actually addressed during the phone conversation. During the interview, no agreement was reached.

Subsequent to the interview, a decision was made to issue a new office action that correctly states the grounds of rejection and disqualifies the Krichen reference. Applicant greatly appreciates that these steps will be taken.

Applicant respectfully requests that if the same or similar rejections are presented in the new action, that the substantive issues previously raised by Applicant are addressed and that the Examiner explain his interpretation of the references/claims and how the references would teach the claimed invention.

For example, the passages relied on in Albert et al. relate to the ability to download a software program from a web site. That software program is then run and provides a direct connection to transmit patient information from one patient to a doctor/clinic. The relevant claim elements relate to the ability to respond to a request generated through a web site for information from a database. In other words, patients provide data to the database, an interested party e.g., a doctor, accesses a web site and requests that data from the database. Sato et al. teaches paying a doctor for medical services. Electronic debiting, accounting software, etc. may be used and the

Applicants: Riff et al.
Serial No. 09/943,193
Page 2

process may be automated. This reference does not teach monitoring data accessed/requested (e.g., that accessed via the website) to determine how to charge for the service of providing access to the database.

Applicant holds the position that the combined references do not teach the claimed invention. If the Examiner asserts otherwise, Applicant again respectfully requests a fuller explanation of the Examiner's interpretation of the claims and how he is applying the references to the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/24/04

By: 

Daniel G. Chapik
Reg. No. 43,424
Telephone: (763) 514-3066
Fax: (763) 505-2530
Customer No. 27581